



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

PL

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,379	07/11/2003	Jalpesh Patadia	BEAS-01362US0	4910
23910	7590	05/02/2007	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER LLP			LONG, ANDREA NATAE	
650 CALIFORNIA STREET				
14TH FLOOR				
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/02/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/618,379	PATADIA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrea N. Long	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :10/19/2004, 09/07/2004, 02/07/2005, 01/05/2005, 03/31/2004, 07/29/2006, 06/21/2006, 03/16/2005, 02/13/2006.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-44 have been examined in response to application filed 07/11/2003.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 3, 14, 24, and 36 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims recite, "an element can one of", it should be rewritten to recite, "an element can be on of". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claims 22, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. Claims 22, 33, and 34 recite the limitations "the VCR" and "the API" in the last paragraph of the claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 34-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Independent claim 34 recites “A computer data signal embodied in a transmission medium”. Signals do not fall within the four categories (process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter) of patent eligible subject matter.

Dependent claims 34-44 are rejected for inheriting the deficiencies of the independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-10, 12-20, 22-31, and 33-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al (Pub. No.: US 2003/0120686 A1), hereinafter “Kim” in view of Emmanuel Tanyi (Easy XML, 2000), hereinafter “Tanyi” in further view of Park et al (Pub. No.: US 2004/0024812 A1), hereinafter “Park”.**

As to independent claim 1, Kim teaches an interactive tool for viewing and manipulating a virtual content repository (VCR) having an application program interface (API),

comprising (page 2 paragraph [0020] → Kim discloses a graphical user interface environment to allow a user to visually manipulate and operate information associated with a tree structure):

providing a first graphical user interface (GUI) configured to present a hierarchical namespace wherein the namespace includes at least one element, and wherein one of the at least one element can be selected (Fig. 7A reference characters 702 & 704, page 6 paragraph [0082] → Kim teaches a tree structure displayed with selectable elements);

providing a second GUI configured to present and to enable editing of content associated with the selected element in the first GUI (Fig. 7B reference character 722, Fig. 7C, page 7 paragraphs [0087] [0088] → Kim teaches having associated information of the selected element displayed in a second screen which allows for editing of an HTML file); and wherein the VCR includes at least one content repository which includes a service provider interface (page 4 paragraph [0059] → Kim teaches having to access files on a service server. Kim implies providing a third GUI for modifying the schema of a selected element but does not forcefully teach it, (Fig. 8A reference characters 806 & 808) nor does Kim forcefully teach wherein the SPI is compatible with an API . Tanyi teaches providing a GUI configured to present and to enable editing of schema associated with the selected element in a first GUI (pages 4 and 5 → Tanyi teaches having a dialogue box appear when a selection of a node for editing the schema is executed). Park teaches a content publication system contains a content repository, which includes a SPI compatible with an API (page 3 paragraphs [0033][0041], page 6 paragraph [0069] → Park teaches the content producer can use the content manipulation API in the service publication server).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the interactive tool of Kim with the third GUI of Tanyi to offer a simple user interface that represents multiple views of XML data and rapidly create and manipulate XML structures (page 1, Tanyi) in addition to combining the compatibility of a SPI and an API to allow for different devices to generate programs for different device output formats and storing the programs in the web server (page 2 paragraph [0015], Park).

As to dependent claim 2, Kim teaches wherein the namespace spans information in each one of the at least one content repository (Fig. 7A → Kim teaches the nodes being collapsible or expandable by use of + and – blocks located beside the nodes).

As to dependent claim 3, Kim teaches wherein an element can be a content node (page 6 paragraph [0082]).

As to dependent claim 4, Kim in view of Tanyi teaches interactive tool for viewing and manipulating a virtual content repository. Kim does not teach an SPI enabling a content repository to be integrated into a VCR. Park teaches wherein the SPI enables the at least one content repository to be integrated into the VCR (page 3 paragraph [0035] → Park teaches having an integrate search service for integrating data from various sources and allowing for search based on search conditions).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the interactive tool of Kim in view of Tanyi with the enabling of Park to allow for different devices to generate programs for different device output formats and storing the programs in the web server (page 2 paragraph [0015], Park).

As to dependent claim 5, Kim teaches the first GUI presents the namespace as a tree (Fig. 7A).

As to dependent claim 6, Kim teaches the first GUI can selectively present nodes having only content or schemas (Fig. 7A → Kim teaches the nodes being collapsible or expandable by use of + and – blocks located beside the nodes).

As to dependent claim 7, Kim teaches interactive tool for viewing and manipulating a virtual content repository. Kim does not teach a second GUI presenting all properties and values associated with a selected element. Tanyi teaches the second GUI can presents all properties and values associated with the selected element in the first GUI (page 3 → Tanyi teaches when an item is selected “AUCTIONBLOCK”, all of the elements associated properties and values are presented to a user).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the interactive tool of Kim with the presenting of properties and values of Tanyi to offer a simple user interface that represents multiple views of XML data and rapidly create and manipulate XML structures (page 1, Tanyi).

As to dependent claim 8, Kim teaches interactive tool for viewing and manipulating a virtual content repository. Kim does not teach a third GUI for presenting property attributes associated with a selected element. Tanyi teaches the third GUI can present all property attributes associated with the selected element in the first GUI (page 3 → Tanyi teaches displaying all property attributes of the selected element such as “title”, “artist”, “dimensions”, etc).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the interactive tool of Kim with the presenting of properties attributes of Tanyi to offer a simple user interface that represents multiple views of XML data and rapidly create and manipulate XML structures (page 1, Tanyi).

As to dependent claim 9, Kim teaches interactive tool for viewing and manipulating a virtual content repository. Kim does not teach allowing elements to be moved copied or deleted. Tanyi teaches the first GUI allows elements to be moved “Element to Attribute”, copied “Duplicate Element Sub Tree”, and deleted “Delete Element Only” from the namespace (page 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the interactive tool of Kim with the modifying elements of Tanyi to offer a simple user interface that represents multiple views of XML data and rapidly create and manipulate XML structures (page 1, Tanyi).

As to dependent claim 10, Kim teaches interactive tool for viewing and manipulating a virtual content repository. Kim does not teach a selection of an element in a first GUI causes presentation in a third GUI. Tanyi teaches selection of an element in the first GUI causes the presentation of the third GUI (page 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the interactive tool of Kim with the selecting and presenting of elements of Tanyi to offer a simple user interface that represents multiple views of XML data and rapidly create and manipulate XML structures (page 1, Tanyi).

As to independent claim 12, claim 12 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Park teaches wherein the SPI enables the at least one content repository to be integrated into the VCR (page 3 paragraph [0035] → Park teaches having an integrate search service for integrating data from various sources and allowing for search based on search conditions).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the interactive tool of Kim with the third GUI of Tanyi to offer a simple user interface that represents multiple views of XML data and rapidly create and manipulate XML structures (page 1, Tanyi) in addition to the enabling by the SPI of Park to allow for different devices to generate programs for different device output formats and storing the programs in the web server (page 2 paragraph [0015], Park).

As to dependent claim 13, Kim teaches the namespace spans information in each one of the at least one content repository (Fig. 7A → Kim teaches the nodes being collapsible or expandable by use of + and – blocks located beside the nodes).

As to dependent claim 14, Kim teaches wherein an element can be a content node (page 6 paragraph [0082]).

As to dependent claim 15, Kim teaches the first GUI presents the namespace as a tree (Fig. 7A).

As to dependent claim 16, Kim teaches the first GUI can selectively present nodes having only content or schemas (Fig. 7A → Kim teaches the nodes being collapsible or expandable by use of + and – blocks located beside the nodes).

As to dependent claim 17, Kim teaches interactive tool for viewing and manipulating a virtual content repository. Kim does not teach a second GUI presenting all properties and values associated with a selected element. Tanyi teaches the second GUI can presents all properties and values associated with the selected element in the first GUI (page 3 → Tanyi teaches when an item is selected “AUCTIONBLOCK”, all of the elements associated properties and values are presented to a user).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the interactive tool of Kim with the presenting of properties and values of Tanyi

to offer a simple user interface that represents multiple views of XML data and rapidly create and manipulate XML structures (page 1, Tanyi).

As to dependent claim 18, Kim teaches interactive tool for viewing and manipulating a virtual content repository. Kim does not teach a third GUI for presenting property attributes associated with a selected element. Tanyi teaches the third GUI can present all property attributes associated with the selected element in the first GUI (page 3 → Tanyi teaches displaying all property attributes of the selected element such as “title”, “artist”, “dimensions”, etc).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the interactive tool of Kim with the presenting of properties attributes of Tanyi to offer a simple user interface that represents multiple views of XML data and rapidly create and manipulate XML structures (page 1, Tanyi).

As to dependent claim 19, Kim teaches interactive tool for viewing and manipulating a virtual content repository. Kim does not teach allowing elements to be moved copied or deleted. Tanyi teaches the first GUI allows elements to be moved “Element to Attribute”, copied “Duplicate Element Sub Tree”, and deleted “Delete Element Only” from the namespace (page 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the interactive tool of Kim with the modifying elements of Tanyi to offer a

simple user interface that represents multiple views of XML data and rapidly create and manipulate XML structures (page 1, Tanyi).

As to dependent claim 20, Kim teaches interactive tool for viewing and manipulating a virtual content repository. Kim does not teach a selection of an element in a first GUI causes presentation in a third GUI. Tanyi teaches selection of an element in the first GUI causes the presentation of the third GUI (page 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the interactive tool of Kim with the selecting and presenting of elements of Tanyi to offer a simple user interface that represents multiple views of XML data and rapidly create and manipulate XML structures (page 1, Tanyi).

As to independent claims 22, 33, and 34, they incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and are rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 23-31, they are rejected under the same rationale as claims 2-10 respectively.

As to dependent claims 35-43, they are rejected under the same rationale as claims 2-10 respectively.

8. **Claims 11, 21, 32, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Tanyi in further view of Park in further view of IBM TDB (Method and System for Visually Constructing Document Type Definitions and Related Artifacts Using a Reusable Object Model, 2001), hereinafter “IBM TDB”.**

As to dependent claim 11, Kim in view of Tanyi in further view of Park teaches providing GUIs to present and enable editing of associated data of a selected node in a first GUI. However, Kim in view of Tanyi in further view of Park does not teach providing a fourth GUI configured to present and to enable editing of configuration parameters associated with a selected content repository or root node in the first GUI. IBM TDB teaches having a visual DTD Editor for constructing DTD. IBM TDB further teaches wherein the DTD includes parameters (Page 1). While IBM TDB does not forcefully disclose “configuration” parameters and a GUI, DTDs act to “configure” a document, since DTDs define documents accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to interpret IBM TDB as directed to configuration parameters and extend Kim’s GUIs to accept IBM TDB’s DTD editing (i.e. as a 4th GUI) for constructing features of configuration and to have them displayed in a GUI to allow a user to modify the way a system is set up for a particular element based on their personal preferences.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have combined the features of Kim in view of Tanyi in further view of Park with the constructing of parameters of IBM TDB to offer a simple user interface that represents multiple views of XML data and rapidly create and manipulate XML structures.

As to dependent claim 21, Kim in view of Tanyi in further view of Park teaches providing GUIs to present and enable editing of associated data of a selected node in a first GUI. However, Kim in view of Tanyi in further view of Park does not teach providing a fourth GUI configured to present and to enable editing of configuration parameters associated with a selected content repository or root node in the first GUI. IBM TDB teaches having a visual DTD Editor for constructing DTD. IBM TDB further teaches wherein the DTD includes parameters (Page 1). While IBM TDB does not forcefully disclose “configuration” parameters and a GUI, DTDs act to “configure” a document, since DTDs define documents accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to interpret IBM TDB as directed to configuration parameters and extend Kim’s GUIs to accept IBM TDB’s DTD editing (i.e. as a 4th GUI) for constructing features of configuration and to have them displayed in a GUI to allow a user to modify the way a system is set up for a particular element based on their personal preferences.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have combined the features of Kim in view of Tanyi in further view of Park with the constructing of parameters of IBM TDB to offer a simple user interface that represents multiple views of XML data and rapidly create and manipulate XML structures.

As to dependent claims 32 and 44, they are rejected under the same rationale as claim 11.

Art Unit: 2176

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record on Form PTO 892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea N. Long whose telephone number is 571-270-1055. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 6:00 am to 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrea Long
04/19/2007

William F. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER